

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

10
11 SAN DISK CORPORATION,

No. C 11-5243 RS

12 v. Plaintiff,

**ORDER RESETTING HEARING ON
MOTION TO STRIKE**

13
14 ROUND ROCK RESEARCH LLC

15 Defendant.

16 _____ /
17
18 Three days prior to the hearing scheduled on plaintiff's motion to strike portions of
19 defendant's expert reports, defendant filed a motion to strike portions of plaintiff's expert reports.
20 Regardless of the degree to which the motions may involve segregable issues, the subject matter of
21 the motions is such that it in the interest of judicial efficiency to hear them together, and not to have
22 two hearings in the same case on topics that are at least similar within a span of weeks.

23 It is unclear why defendant waited until this juncture to bring its motion, and any attempt to
24 gain a perceived tactical advantage or to cause delay in resolution of plaintiff's motion is not to be
25 condoned. Nevertheless, given the trial date, there will be no undue prejudice to plaintiff in
26 continuing the hearing on its motion such that the two motions can be heard together. The parties
27 shall meet and confer in the event any other case management deadlines need to be adjusted as a
28 result.

1 Going forward, the parties are encouraged to work cooperatively in scheduling any motion
2 practice to avoid setting multiple hearings when unnecessary. The parties' respective motions to
3 strike shall both be heard on March 20, 2014.

4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6

7 Dated: 2/10/14

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE